

The FCC charged with regulating non-government use of the broadcast spectrum still retains the responsibility to act in the interests of the American people. This particularly means ensuring broadcasters act to promote the public interest, convenience, or necessity.

While I don't have an understanding of the issues influencing the decisions of the Commissioners, I'm sure that their actions are supposed to be fair and independent of political agendas. Likewise I may not fully understand what appears to be reluctance to exercise it's powers relating to the revocation of licenses (when such action is called for), nor why the agency is limited to that one main regulatory power. Nevertheless, when faced with blatant attempts of a corporate citizen to apply undue influence and affect the outcome a close political race as important as that of the Presidency of the United States, action is called for and use of any and all regulatory authority is appropriate.

Sinclair Broadcast Group's recent actions, both as expressed and that come to pass, illustrate the dangers to localism caused by media consolidation. This is an issue that bears both action and close attention.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Misuse of the public airways must not be tolerated.

Whether or not the agency should additionally seek greater powers for enforcing regulations is certainly an issue deserving attention. However, the agency "must not" avoid action when it's called for; even if that action is the threat of or actual revocation of existing public broadcast licenses.

Sinclair represents just such a case; prior warning with the promise of termination of license (it strikes me that an earnest promise of such punishment should prove satisfactory) should they engage in unfair/unbalanced political advertising is a perfectly reasonable and fully justified step in the right

direction.

We, the people, will support you fully in your actions to maintain and ensure proper broadcasting ethics and behavior.

Thank you.